



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

one species had advanced a little upon the preceding, and so imparted something of its resemblance, but he was the end contemplated. He has a blood-relationship to all objects in nature. The one life flows in all veins. "The Divine," says Swedenborg, "is in all and everything, still there is nothing of what is divine in itself in their esse; for all is *from* God, but is not God; and being from God, his image is in it, as the image of a man in a mirror, in which the man appears, but still there is nothing of the man in it."

ART. VII.—1. *The Causes, Principles, and Results of the Present Conflict. A Discourse delivered before the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, on its CCXXIII. Anniversary, June 3, 1861.* By S. K. LOTHROP, D. D., Pastor of the Brattle Square Church, Boston. Boston. 1861. pp. 70.

2. *Wars and Rumors of Wars. A Sermon preached at the Union Church in Groton, Mass., on Sunday, April 21, 1861.* By the Pastor, REV. EDWIN A. BULKLEY. Cambridge. 1861. pp. 16.

3. *Our Sacrifices. A Sermon preached in the West Church, November 3, 1861, being the Sunday after the Funeral of Lieut. William Lowell Putnam.* By C. A. BARTOL. Boston: Ticknor and Fields. 1861. pp. 23.

4. *The Lessons of our National Conflict. An Address before the Alumni of Yale College, at their Annual Meeting, July 24, 1861.* By JULIAN M. STURTEVANT, President of Illinois College. New Haven. 1861. pp. 21.

5. *Patriotism and the Slaveholders' Rebellion. An Oration.* By C. S. HENRY. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1861. pp. 34.

6. *The Rebellion: its Latent Causes and True Significance. In Letters to a Friend abroad.* By HENRY T. TUCKERMAN. New York: James G. Gregory. 1861. pp. 48.

7. *Cheap Cotton by Free Labor.* By a Cotton Manufacturer. Boston: A. Williams & Co. 1861. pp. 52.

8. *The Rejected Stone : or Insurrection vs. Resurrection in America.* By a Native of Virginia. Boston : Walker, Wise, & Co. 1861. pp. 132.

FEW words have been more currently perverted from their true signification than *loyalty*, and with the misuse of the word the sentiment which it rightfully represents has suffered decline. We need hardly say that loyalty really denotes fidelity to the law, especially to the constitution or fundamental law of the land. Nor is its sense passive merely, denoting the qualities of the obedient subject alone, but with these the advocacy and championship of the law to the full measure of one's ability. The word, in common usage, stands for fidelity to the sovereign or executive head of the nation, whether he revere or set at naught the constitution under which he professes to govern. Thus at the periods — so frequent within the last thirty years — when the thrones of Continental Europe have quaked and tottered, not he who vindicated the natural or prescriptive rights of the people which were invaded at all points when autocracy took courage in Napoleon's disgrace and exile, but he who made himself the supple minion of usurped and irresponsible power, was termed loyal. Thus, too, we are in the habit of calling those misguided, though often honest men, who adhered to the British ministry in their invasion of the rights of the American Colonies, loyalists, while that appellation belongs in justice to the patriots of our Revolution, who maintained at the peril of their lives the cause of legal liberty against extra-legal exaction and oppression. In fine, *loyalist* has been made synonymous with *royalist*, while, in fact, the two terms are often applicable to opposite parties.

In our country, since the Revolution, we have lost the opportunity of using the term *royalist* concerning our own citizens; and we have made very little use of *loyalist*, because the sentiment of loyalty has grown feeble and inert. Allegiance to royalty has in all ages been less a principle, than a mean, selfish, timeserving instinct; and the chief bane of our land has been this same instinct, developed in the only form in which it could take shape, that of man-worship. It has always been the vicious tendency of republics to forsake principles for

men,— instead of placing themselves under the guidance of unchanging maxims of sound and just policy, “to make gods that shall go before them,” and gods often as little worthy of reverence as the golden calf which the Hebrews cast for that purpose. Eloquence, heroism, the prestige of military success, administrative sagacity, or financial skill, with however large an alloy of baser metal, is idolized, and can lead the people at will. Any hold that a man can get upon fame enshrines him in the hearts of his fellow-citizens, and makes them his pliant instruments to effect his ends, be they noble, be they base. This proclivity was the ruin of the ancient republics, and has brought our own to the brink of dissolution. The successive compromises by which we have postponed issues when they were manageable till they were widened beyond the capacity of peaceable adjustment, have been brought about, not by the honest, deliberate judgment of the people, but by their blind trust in leaders, sometimes atrociously corrupt, sometimes upright in purpose, but warped by sectional or party prejudice. The treason which now convulses our country could have been developed into the power of harming only by unreasoning confidence in high functionaries, either themselves traitors, or weak enough to involve themselves in unconscious complicity with traitors. This excessive man-worship had its origin among us in the honor justly due and worthily rendered to the great men of Providence, who led our armies and presided over our counsels in the war of the Revolution; but it was very early transferred to idols like that in Nebuchadnezzar’s vision, “part of gold, and part of miry clay,” and from year to year there has been less of the gold and more of the clay in their structure.

In the present condition of our affairs, it is in some quarters regarded as marking the depth of our calamity, and the desperateness of our national fortunes, that there remain to us few or no men of the first rank, whether in political or in military life. Among the recent dead were some who left not their equals behind them. Of those who made the nearest approach to them in the esteem of large numbers of their countrymen, some have turned traitors; others show but too plainly an order of ability far below the needs and demands of the time. The only man to whom in our stress of peril all hearts

turned as to one equally fitted to lead our armies and to exert a controlling influence in our counsels, yields to the inevitable infirmity of advancing years at the moment when the country most needs his wisdom and his prowess; while the issues which, while we write, seem approaching the arbitrament of arms, depend on the guidance of one whose name a year ago had not begun to fill the public ear. It indicated rare political sagacity in the Romans of the Commonwealth, that in times of imminent peril they suspended republican usages, and intrusted a dictator with supreme power. Could we do the same, lives there the man whom we would be willing to raise to the dictatorship? But this very destitution may, when the strife is over, be of immeasurable and enduring benefit; for it will have transferred our allegiance from men to law.

In illustrating the grounds of loyalty, we would first say that our Constitution claims our allegiance, because it is law and order,—the only government possible for us, the only bond of peace and beneficent relations by which our nation can be held together, and can maintain its place among the nations of the earth. The theory of the Secessionists resolves itself into universal disintegration and anarchy. Had the now rebel States proffered their demand for a separate government in constitutional methods, had they sought to be released from their compact by the consent of the co-contracting parties, and quietly awaited the action of Congress and of State conventions, we do not say that there might not have been found insuperable obstacles in the way of their separation; but at all events the issue would have had a fair trial, and its settlement would no doubt have been the restoration of amicable relations, whether under one or two governments. To us it seems highly probable that the growing dissiliency of local institutions and interests would have indicated the expediency of forming a Southern republic. If we rightly understood the prevalent sentiment of the North in the interval between the Secession Ordinance of South Carolina and the attack on Fort Sumter, there was even a very general willingness that the recusant States should remain out of the Union; and it was only that mean and dastardly assault that aroused the North-

ern people to the consciousness that Secession, by the mere arbitrary act of a portion of the States, dissolved the compact of the remainder, and destroyed the republic. Yet there is not a single ground on which the act of the Southern States in withdrawing from the Confederacy can be justified, on which, by parity of reason, the Middle States might not withdraw from the Northern, the Pacific from the Atlantic, Connecticut from Massachusetts, nay, on which New York or Boston might not man the forts in its harbor, raise an army among its populace, and declare itself an independent city. Still further, the same line of argument justifies the highway robber or the pirate, if he only solemnly assert his independence of the government within whose precincts he has lived, in considering himself as a government, and levying war on all such as will not concede whatever he claims.

This statement, we know, bears absurdity on its face ; but the absurdity lies in once admitting the right to repudiate the existing order of society, to which consent has been given whether by express contract or by the contract implied in accepting its protection and its privileges. If this right manifestly does not reside in any one man, it cannot reside in any body of men by virtue of their numbers, or of the territory which they occupy, or of any subordinate body politic which they may constitute ; for it is impossible to define the kind of aggregation or corporation which confers on its members rights which are not theirs in their individual capacity, and the right to break an express or implied contract does not appertain to any individual, and is therefore not among the rights which individuals concede to society.

Is it asked, Where, then, is the right of revolution ? We answer, Revolution is a necessity rather than a right ; or if in any case it becomes a right, it becomes so, not by virtue of the aggregation or the sub-corporate capacity of the revolutionists, but by breach of contract on the part of the supreme government, which forfeits the allegiance of its subjects by violating its own fundamental law, and by substituting extortion or oppression for the protection it is bound to render. But the pretext of the present attempt at revolution is not breach of contract, or violation of the fundamental law on the part of

the supreme authority, but the action of that fundamental law in purely constitutional methods.

In fine, the question at issue is not that of conflicting rights, but that of government or no government. We doubt whether, in accordance with Christian ethics, war can often be justified. Self-defence is indeed the inalienable right of nations no less than of individuals, and we have no sympathy with the ultraism which would forbid forcible resistance to wanton and unprovoked invasion ; but, except against savage tribes, a purely defensive war is wellnigh impossible. Two civilized nations can hardly be involved in hostilities, unless both by their own acts assume a mutually hostile attitude, and each furnish at least a reasonable pretext for aggression on the part of the other. But if any over-scrupulous moralists demur at the present conflict as bearing the unchristian title of war, we would reply, that on the part of the United States, while it has the form, it has none of the essential characteristics of a war. It is the self-defence of government against anarchy. It is a grand police movement for the suppression of multitudinous crime, and is to be justified on the same principles, and no other, on which our civil authorities employ force in apprehending burglars or murderers, at the risk of their lives if they make violent resistance.

We can allege, indeed, no more imperative reasons for loyalty than those which involve the very existence of social order ; but they are reasons which might be urged under any constitution or form of government which was designed and adapted to protect life, liberty, and property. Our Constitution has paramount claims upon our loyalty on still higher grounds, as sound in its theory, beneficent in its working, and susceptible of easy adaptation to the growth and the altered condition of the people.

The great desideratum in a government is, that it reserve to itself adequate power for protection, and none for oppression, and that it concede to the people individually and in their subordinate corporations whatever liberties they can exercise without detriment to their aggregate security and well-being,—in fine, that it unite the maximum of strength with the maximum of freedom. And let it not be forgotten that

these two maxima exist only in combination. A feeble government shows its weakness in no way more luculently than in its inability to protect its subjects in the enjoyment of their undoubted rights; while an oppressed nation fritters away the strength of its government, either by its perpetual oppugnancy and its acts of incipient rebellion, if it be an intelligent and self-respecting people, or by its inertness and abjectness, if its heart have been crushed out under its burdens.

Our Constitution gives us a government second to none in strength. Under it the States—contemptibly feeble under the loose *régime* of an ill-compacted confederacy, without credit or honor, with no central force, and with the wildest centrifugal tendencies—sprang at once into a mighty people, assumed an unchallenged place in the sisterhood of the nations, made the public credit inviolate, established commercial relations with rival mercantile powers on equal or reciprocal terms, restored tranquillity at home, and secured respect for the flag of the republic on every sea, and for its ministers at every court in Christendom. What our government then achieved it has maintained till the present disastrous epoch, and is now laboring to restore, with a wisdom and vigor that give every possible presage of success and perpetuity. Meanwhile, our political system has extended the domain of law and of social order, from its original narrow belt of territory, across the continent,—its executive arm not weakened by distances over which no other power has ever stretched continuously; its legislation harmonizing interests more widely dissident than those of all the kingdoms of Europe; its tribunals omnipresent in their force, irresistible in their decrees, and, with the rarest exceptions, uncorrupt and incorruptible. The rushing floods of immigration have proved our land to be literally “the desire of all nations”; while the might of our government to protect, and its powerlessness to oppress, have converted these myriads from all parts of the civilized world into loyal citizens. Indeed, though we complain, not wholly without reason, of the stubborn persistency of national characteristics in large classes of those who come to us from the other side of the Atlantic, none love our country so well as those who know it by contrast with other coun-

tries, and none are more worthy of its confidence and honor than their children, who have learned the contrast on the worse side by the traditions of their parents and elders, and on the better by nurture and experience.

But while the government of these States is thus strong for all purposes for which its strength is called into requisition, where else is liberty secured as on our soil? Except in certain specified cases of wrong and crime, our central administration hardly comes into contact with the individual, leaves his industry free, insures to him equal rights through the whole length and breadth of the land, exacts no onerous service, presses with a burden which none can feel in the collection of its ordinary revenue, and renders paternal offices at a cost bearing no appreciable ratio to their worth, in its lights and beacons on the coast, its unsurpassed mail service, its surveys and explorations, its consular system, and its ocean police. Its relation to the separate States must be defined in similar terms. It reserves to itself not a single power which they could exercise otherwise than to their own detriment. It leaves them supreme at all points at which their supremacy could be maintained without mutual annoyance, discord, and hostility. It interferes with institutions in their nature local, only to limit them to their proper habitat, and to protect them there. It suffers no intrusion on vested rights, though in the holiest names and with the most beneficent purposes. It permits not even philanthropy to pass the just metes and bounds of local jurisdiction, and secures to each member of the Federal Union the right of self-reform in its own time and way. As regards the integrity of its relations to the several States, we have not only the testimony of its friends, but equally the admission of those now arrayed in arms for its dissolution, that in the entire history of our government there has not been a single instance of the violation of the rights they claim, not a single precedent for such acts of usurpation as they profess to apprehend.

But no constitution can be perfect. Even were one relatively, it could not be absolutely, perfect; for social man is progressive, and may outgrow the government under which he lives. Its capacity of adaptation constitutes, therefore, an

added claim upon our loyalty to the Constitution of the United States. This capacity resides in its separate provisions, and in the terms in which they are enacted. These are not rigid, but flexible,—not precise and technical, but broad in their scope and liberal in their intent. They prescribe principles, not details,—objects to be attained, not the specific modes of attaining them,—the general type, not the exact embodiment of the type. The only exceptions to this statement are exceptions without which the government could not have been organized, namely, the steps to be taken in the choice of its elective members. Nay, even these have become greatly modified in practice. Thus, though the founders of the Constitution intended that the President and Vice-President should be created by the *bona fide* choice of the Electors alone, they are now as truly chosen by the popular suffrage as if their names were given in at the ballot-box. In all else, the Constitution admits of a wide latitude of interpretation, in accordance with the needs, the progress, and the spirit of the people. The written document, without the change of a word, is susceptible of as easy modification and growth as the unwritten Constitution of Great Britain. Thus, should slavery ever be abolished, we know not of a single alteration which would be required to adapt the Constitution to this most desirable condition of civilized society. The provision for the representation of three fifths of other persons than citizens and Indians would, indeed, remain a dead letter, but harmless; while the provision for the restoration of persons bound to service might be made availing now and then for the recovery of an errant apprentice. Slavery, though protected by the Constitution, forms no part of it, and the instrument was, no doubt, expected by many of its founders to survive this blot on our national honor and well-being.

But this is not all. Our Constitution provides for its own peaceful amendment, in such ways as to secure it only against rash and hasty tampering, while the well-considered wishes of the people can always register themselves in our fundamental law.

Such a government we regard as more than the expression of calm wisdom and lofty patriotism. It has its distinctively

providential element. It was God's saving gift to a distracted and imperilled people. It was his creative fiat over a weltering chaos, "Let a nation be born in a day." Loyalty thus has the consecration of a religious duty. It is our due tribute of gratitude to Him whose guiding spirit was with our fathers, and by whose might and love alone our weakness has grown into invincible strength.

How are we to manifest our loyalty? Our nearest duties are those which appertain to the present crisis. Those who have already hazarded their lives for their country demand such honor as we freely give to the memory of the early defenders of our liberty, such substantial and enduring expressions of our gratitude as to them were doled out too late and too scantily. The martyr-roll of the present conflict has names that cannot die upon our lips or in our hearts, and in the rich price already paid for the restoration of peace and union there is the strongest appeal to every sentiment of patriotism. Should the exigencies of the country demand that our army be doubled or quadrupled, we cannot doubt that there will still be brave souls and strong hands for the stress of need and the forefront of danger. Meanwhile there are peaceful services to be rendered for the sustenance and comfort of those who have gone from us, services of provident forethought, of the cunning hand, of liberal charity, of genial sympathy, of due and merited consideration for families bereaved temporarily or permanently of their natural protectors. There is, too, a tone of feeling to be created and sustained, every pulse of which throbs at the seat of government, and runs along the lines of our army; and this every man, woman, and child may help to make true, intense, and fervent. Especially from the educated and cultivated minds of our country may loyal sentiments inspire whatever confidence they breathe, and diffuse the style of thought and feeling they represent; and surely to none should our republic be so dear as to those who can compare its broad and comprehensive freedom and its beneficent care of its humblest members with the tyranny and insolence, the sycophancy and abjectness, which deface the history of those aristocracies and oligarchies which, in accordance with an euphemism of their own, we are wont to call the ancient republics.

Let it be remembered, also, that loyalty includes the culture of every good gift of mind and heart, the creation by each of the best quality and the largest quantity of character attainable ; for the very highest service which any man can render to his country is to be intelligent and wise, strong and brave, pure and upright, one on whose example, influence, and good offices society can always place implicit dependence.

As may be seen from the long list of titles prefixed to this paper, the pamphlet literature of our current quarter—almost the only department of letters which feels not the paralyzing touch of war—is largely occupied with the themes that lie nearest the heart of every loyal citizen of the United States. We have placed at the head of our list the only pamphlet sermons on our national affairs which we have received since our last issue ; but we could hardly enumerate the sermons of marked power and excellence, covering the same ground, that have come to us in the secular and religious newspapers. The relation of the American pulpit to the great crises in our national history is well worthy our emphatic notice. Very slightly infected with the ultraism which denies the right of self-defence, and which therefore, in opposition to the express words of the Divine Teacher, maintains that this earthly life is too precious to be yielded up in the cause of truth and righteousness, our clergy have consistently adhered to the principle that life may be lawfully jeopardized or destroyed where the highest interests of humanity are involved, but only then. True to this ground, they were among the pioneers of the Revolution ; many of them were in the field and in active service ; and from pulpits all over the land went forth the most stirring appeals to patriotism, the most indignant protests against compromise with tyranny. With the establishment of our independence commenced the palmy days of clerical popularity and influence. We doubt whether religion in its vital significance had a stronger hold on the general heart than it has now ; but its ministers for more than an entire generation were the objects of a reverence and homage which seem almost mythical, and which accrued to them in large measure in recognition of their patriotic zeal and devotion. The war of 1812 found the clergy still consistent with them-

selves, and loyal to their religious principles. They, almost to a man — we speak chiefly of the New England clergy — refused to recognize the rightfulness of a war which, as regarded the higher ends of human well-being, was utterly aimless and useless ; they mourned its victories as if they had been defeats, and were in vehement opposition to the administration and the party that had plunged the country into a needless and disastrous conflict. Still more intense was the protest of the American — certainly of the New England — pulpit against the Mexican war, which had not even a pretext of need or justice, which had no end but the extension of slavery, and in whose successful issue many of the clergy, endowed with foresight by their position above the arena of party strife, beheld the undoubted foreshadowing of the very events that are now taking place. We honestly believe that the diminished honor and deference now rendered to the ministers of religion in our Northern States is to be mainly ascribed to the noble stand they took against these two wars, which, however defensible on grounds of policy, were manifestly indefensible in accordance with the principles of Christian ethics, — a stand in which they present a striking contrast to the sycophancy of the English Church, whose prelates cast not a vote, and whose clergy raised hardly a voice against the opium-war. But now that, for the first time since the patriots of the Revolution sheathed the sword, it is drawn in a just and holy cause, none take precedence of the clergy in patriotic fervor ; many of them have entered the public service at a heavy and costly sacrifice ; and those who remain at their posts are foremost in the administration of the various methods of relief, supply, and comfort in which our defenders on the field are sustained by the collective sympathy of the communities that have sent them forth. Whether through this undesigned accordance of clerical influence with the reigning sentiment of the people the clergy will regain in the public esteem the ground which they had lost, is a question which they would be the last to raise. Enough for them that they are true to their Master and their mission.

Dr. Lothrop's sermon is a carefully prepared and elaborate discussion of the causes of the present war, with a brief, yet

distinct and emphatic, summary of the results to be sought from it by the loyal portion of the republic. He regards slavery as the sole source of the jealousies, controversies, and sectional alienation that have now culminated in open hostility. He enters somewhat in detail into the history of the slavery question, and vindicates the right of the North, not indeed to interfere with Southern institutions on their own soil, but to take cognizance of slavery and action upon it wherever it comes into contact with the general administration, or with the local rights and interests of Northern States or citizens. The discourse is calm, candid, judicial, composed almost wholly of clear statement and reasoning on undoubted facts. We quote the following from the closing pages :—

“ Under civil institutions, republican and representative in their character, where there are legitimate, constitutional channels provided for the expression of the popular will, through which the government can be modified, its organic or its statute laws reached, altered, amended, so as to meet the wishes of the majority, or protect the rights of a minority, there can be no justification of rebellion that will stand before the world, or secure a verdict of approval from the pen of impartial history. If we would secure that approval, foreshadowed now by the patriotic instincts of our hearts, let us stand by this constitutional government of the United States, and, at whatever cost, carry it through to the legitimate results of this conflict.

“ There cannot be much difference of opinion among wise and patriotic men, as to what these results should be. The suppression of rebellion, and the just punishment of treason in the persons of its leaders; the establishment of the authority of the United States government over all the States and all the people who have assumed to defy its power, and renounce allegiance to it; the decision of the question of the right of secession without leave asked or granted, by the practical nullification of the right; and a settlement, in some manner, upon some principle or basis, of this whole subject of slavery in such way that it can never again be so brought into politics as to disturb the peace, or endanger the safety of the Union ;— these are the objects to be sought, the results that ought to be reached through this conflict. If ever there was a necessary and righteous war, in which the Christian patriot might buckle on his armor with a clear conscience, and seek a Divine blessing to give energy to his arm and a right direction to his blow, it is this war, in which we are seeking to save a continent from anarchy, and thirty millions of people from political severance ; to uphold a gov-

ernment which, whatever defects attach to it, is the wisest ever framed, and, whatever faults have marked its administration, is the most beneficent that ever ruled. The instinct of the great heart of the people is right in this matter, and nothing in our own history, or the history of any nation, is more wonderful or sublime, than this sudden, hearty, universal uprising of the North, as one man, to sustain the honor of the nation's flag, and the authority of the nation's Constitution and government. Nothing is more sublime than to witness, nothing more grand than to share in the inspiration of a whole people, lifted above the weakness, the dependence, the selfishness, of human nature, by the power of a great and noble sentiment, that nerves them for effort, and sacrifices, and endurance. In this inspiration, which has passed like an electric shock through all the Northern States and people, and had glorious manifestations in all, Massachusetts has largely shared; in this uprising, she has stood nobly forth, and 'every one has helped his neighbor, and every one has said to his brother, Be of good courage.' Through the energy of her Executive, through the promptness of her volunteers, through the ready outpouring of her wealth, and the rich gifts, the work of the hands and hearts of noble women,—her daughters,—in all the manifestations of herself at this period, Massachusetts stands nobly forth, loyal now, as ever, to the great principle of constitutional liberty and government." — pp. 48—51.

Mr. Bulkley's sermon was preached the Sunday after the evacuation of Fort Sumter. It is at once wise and eloquent, indicating a full appreciation of the magnitude of the crisis, firm confidence in the ultimate triumph of the right, and an humble religious trust in God the Judge and Vindicator. Apart from its really great merit, it deserves to be read now, and transmitted to posterity, for its references to the author's birthplace, and to the transactions of the preceding week in the town where it was delivered. We copy, for permanent record, the passage to which we allude, which, with the notes appended to it, belongs to history:—

" Since the last quiet Sabbath day, my hearers, when we sat here anxiously awaiting, but not fully apprehending, what the next day would declare, our community, with every other in the land, has been vibrating with constantly intensified excitement. No rehearsal of its course and growth is necessary. It has been like the hurrying to and fro of the very same week eighty-six years ago, when the rallying-cry of freedom followed the volleys of musketry on Lexington meeting-house hill. The renewal of that cry has been like a tocsin alarm, responded to

with an alacrity, of which I am as proud, as I am ashamed that I had my birth and early boyhood within sight of Sumter's humiliated walls. There is no need of appeals to patriotism, in a town, which sent forth its men at the next dawn after the news, and in three days had them at the point of need, the first uniformed and armed body of State soldiers at the Capitol, fighting their way through a murderous mob, which carried wounds and deaths into their ranks.*

“There is no lack of patriotic hearts, when one commander,† prevented by years and uncontrollable circumstances from casting in his lot with his men, sends the three sons of his household to represent his name.” — p. 13.

Dr. Bartol’s sermon is marked by his wonted richness and delicacy of thought, and pictorial vividness of style. It is an enumeration of the sacrifices we are making for our country, costly, indeed, and unspeakably precious, yet unworthy to be named in comparison with the infinitely greater alternative, sacrifice of freedom and integrity, of all that has been the glory of our land, of all in the future that can insure for us an honored name and place among the nations. We cannot forbear copying the brief sketch of the life of the brave and accomplished young officer whose death called forth this beautiful tribute to his memory: —

“ William Lowell Putnam, born July 9th, 1840, Lieutenant in a Massachusetts company, fell bravely fighting for his country, in the act

* “Fort Sumter was evacuated by its brave little garrison of less than one hundred men, on Sunday afternoon, April 14th, after sustaining an almost uninterrupted bombardment of thirty-four hours, from seven thousand men, and powerful batteries. The President of the United States issued his proclamation on the 15th, calling for seventy-five thousand soldiers from the several States to suppress the rebellion. Late in the evening,—nearly midnight,—Captain Eusebius S. Clark received orders for his command,—Company B of Groton, attached to the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment,—to proceed by railroad to Lowell in the morning. The men who were to be notified were scattered over this town, in its territorial extent one of the largest in the State, and some were found in adjoining towns. Early the next morning, in the midst of a storm, the Groton company joined its regiment, having a number of men who, together with some staff-officers of the regiment, had been connected with the congregation to which this discourse was addressed. They made rapid and triumphal progress towards Washington, until in Baltimore they were attacked by a ruffian crowd of enemies of government, and, though they bravely pressed through, three of the regiment were killed, and several severely wounded. This was on the 19th of April, the anniversary of the battle of Lexington. A second time was Massachusetts blood the first to be spilled for freedom!”

† “Lieut. Colonel Walter Shattuck, of Groton.”

probably of at once leading on his men and making a step to the relief of a wounded officer, in the battle of Ball's Bluff, October 21st, 1861, and he died, at the age of 21, the next day. The State that gave him birth, and to which he gave back honor, joined with his kindred and friends in celebrating his obsequies in this church, last Monday, October the 28th. The coffin lay on the same spot occupied, nine months ago, by that of Dr. Charles Lowell, his maternal grandfather. The corse of the soldier and hero, surmounted with the sword unwielded and motionless in its scabbard, was not unworthy to succeed here that of the preacher and saint; for spiritual weapons were no cleaner in the hands of the first than carnal ones in those of the last. Striking was the contrast made by the youth's silken locks and smooth, fair cheeks, cold in death, with the white hair on the furrowed brow that had also reposed at the shrine so long vocal with well-remembered tones of an eloquent and holy mouth. But there was more union than separation. The benignant resolution of the elder's expression was repeated in the sweet firmness of the young man's lips. They seemed as near together in spirit as circumstantially wide apart. The two venerable names of Lowell and of Putnam—the eminent jurist, as beloved as he was distinguished—were well united in that of the youth; for he justified every supposable law of hereditary descent by continuing in his temper and very look, with the minister's loving earnestness, the singular cordiality, the wondrous and spotless loving-kindness, which in his paternal grandfather's manner was ever like a warm beam of the sun. The delicacy due to the living allows me only to point to a picture such as is seldom exhibited, in his only surviving grandparent, of an intelligently contented, industriously cheerful, Christian old age,—still growing riper and fresher towards almost ninety years. A worthy grandchild William was. He bore out in action, in danger and death, every rising signal and promise of his brief but beautiful life. In the conflict, he cared more for others' peril than for his own. He sank, from all his forward motion, under one mortal wound. But, while he suffered, he smiled. He deprecated any assistance to himself as vain; he urged all to the work before them, and even forbade his soldiers to succor him. 'Do not move me,' he said to his friend; 'it is your duty to leave me; help others; I am going to die, and would rather die on the field.' With noble, yet well-deserved support, however, he was borne nearly a mile to the boat at the fatal river's brink by Henry Howard Sturgis of this city, who left him only to return to fight in his own place, and afterwards watched him like a mother in the hospital, hoping for his restoration. As he lay prostrate, knowing he could not recover, he beckoned to his friend to come to him, that he might praise

the courage of his men in the encounter, rather than to say anything of himself. With such patient composure he endured his anguish and weakness, probably no mortal but himself could suspect how far he was gone. He sent home the simple message of love. Brightly, concealing his pangs, he wore away the weary hours. Cheerfully, on the Tuesday morning which was his last on earth, he spoke to his faithful servant, George. He closed his eyes at length, and did not open them again, presenting, and perhaps knowing, no distinction between sleep and death. He ‘is not dead, but sleepeth,’ might it not have been said again? But, like the child raised by our Lord, he slept but a little. The greatness of his waking who shall tell?” — pp. 15–18.

Our literary anniversaries, during the last summer, furnished valuable opportunities for the inculcation of loyal sentiments on the cultivated mind of the North. We doubt whether on any one of these occasions a purely literary subject was chosen or would have been welcome, while patriotic utterances can have nowhere met a heartier response than from the students and alumni of our colleges. President Sturtevant’s Address is profoundly serious, probing the morbid anatomy of our body politic for the causes of the existing civil war, and urging thorough reformation as that which alone can make success in arms of any avail in the creation of a future better than our lowering and stormy past. He lays especial stress on the political atheism, the “want of loyalty to right, to changeless, eternal justice,” in which, we agree with him, all our social and public evils have had their origin. Never till our nation recognizes the immutability of the Divine law, can its peace and prosperity rest on an immovable basis.

Dr. Henry’s Oration, prepared for a literary anniversary, is mainly devoted to an exhibition of the deadening influence of slavery on patriotism. It is pure, chaste, and classical in style and structure, as is everything that comes from his pen, and at the same time singularly plain and direct, the orator retaining all the grace of his liberal culture while he throws aside the academic robes. He records in the following instructive paragraphs the growth and change of his own opinions on two subjects, with reference to which many honest and thoughtful minds have passed concurrently with his through the process he indicates.

“Last winter I thought that if the slaveholding States were deliberately determined to go out of the Union, and would do it peaceably and honestly, and wait until the thing could be legally accomplished, I would be for letting them go. I thought we should in many respects be well rid of them; and that they would learn some salutary lessons from the experiment of setting up for themselves, and after a little be glad to come back and behave better in the Union.

“But I am of a different mind now. Events have shown a settled determination on the part of the conspirators to effect a permanent division of the country. I see that the material interests of the nation demand the preservation of the integrity of the national domain. These Southern States are geographically and politically necessary to us as a nation. Those most necessary to round out and complete the national area are ours by every claim. We have bought them, and paid for them, and fought for them, and bled for them. What with purchase-money paid,—what with fortifications and defences built,—what with driving the natives out and the war waged with Mexico, they have cost us millions of treasure and thousands of lives. If the ‘right of secession’ for any of the original thirteen members of the Union be (as it is) an absurd claim, it is for these newer States too monstrously absurd to deserve a moment’s regard. They belong to us by every title. They are ours of right,—ours as a necessary possession,—and we must keep them. It would never do to have an independent slave empire on our Southern frontier in possession of the Mexican gulf and of the outlet of the great rivers of the West. It would be a perpetual source of irritation, conflict, and war. The two great conflicting systems of social order could never live peaceably side by side. And even if they could, the cause of Christian civilization, and the great interests of human progress, forbid us ever to consent to the dismemberment of the national domain in order to establish a great empire based upon the contradiction of the Declaration of Independence.

“We have, it seems to me, no election. The rebellion must be crushed. Nothing short of this will do.

“And as to the fate of slavery in the sequel of the war, we must leave it to the future. Opposed as I am in my inmost soul to slavery, and delighted as I should be to see the Constitution purged of every recognition and guaranty to it, and brought back to perfect harmony with the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, and believing, as I do, that this will some day be done; rejoiced as I should be at the entire extinction of slavery throughout the land, and confident as I am that it will some day be accomplished,—I have never been willing to

incur the responsibility of advocating the immediate emancipation of the slaves in mass,—especially in the lower States, where the slave population is so dense. I have indeed been in the habit heretofore of thinking, and on more than one public occasion have declared the conviction, that immediate emancipation would be no mercy to the slaves and a great curse to the country. But I confess to a less decided opinion now. I do not know that the slaves would be any better off at first. But I have less apprehension of results disastrous to social order and security than I formerly entertained. Manumission worked peacefully in St. Domingo for seven years; and it was not until the attempt made by Napoleon after that time to reduce the blacks again to slavery, that those scenes of bloody horror were enacted which have been so often held up to alarm and to warn. Emancipation worked peacefully in the British West India islands. It might work so here. Still the future of slavery in this country is to me a problem dark and difficult of solution. *But time makes many dark things clear*,—and often in a wonderfully short and decisive way. I am more and more every year impressed with this truth.”—pp. 30—32.

Mr. Tuckerman’s pamphlet, under the guise of letters written to a friend abroad, gives a very thorough and careful analysis of certain secondary causes of the rebellion, such as the decline of public spirit, the provincial isolation of a large proportion of the citizens of the South, and the effect of slavery on character. He, most appropriately, as regards the ostensible direction and purpose of his book, enters into a detailed exhibition of the falsity and the injurious tendencies of foreign criticism on American affairs. The following passage on the “decline of public spirit” has an obvious connection with the subject of this article, and suggests considerations well worthy the heed of loyal citizens.

“One of the most remote, and, at the same time, most pervasive, causes of the present disaffection, is the general neglect of civic duty. Flattered into passivity by an overweening confidence in the stability of our institutions, and repelled by the distasteful and troublesome process whereby the citizen’s functions are realized,—engrossed by private cares and enterprise, and the sense of our privileges and obligations, as members of a great republic, deadened by material prosperity, we have, to a great extent, evaded the claims of our country, and the vigilance and activity through which alone her security and sacredness can be preserved. The field being thus deserted, statesmanship has declined,

and politics become a trade; until the nation was aroused by the outbreak of civil war into consciousness of peril. The strife of party has thus been degraded into a vulgar scramble for emoluments; the able and honored representatives of opinion, whose very names were once watchwords of fidelity and of fame, were superseded by men of secondary ability and equivocal character; office was regarded as compensation for partisan service, with an utter disregard to fitness; patent abuses were tolerated; and corruption so invaded the administration of government, from venal legislation to an imbecile executive, as to afford every facility for treason. This demoralization was confined to no section; the patriotic sentiment remained, but its practical and organized expression was silenced by apathy and indifference, until actual violence succeeded base fraud; then, indeed, the dormant love of country awoke, — breathing in emphatic protest and earnest appeal from pulpit, rostrum, journal, — assemblies, armies, households, and official proclamations. Against these tardy but true utterances of popular sentiment — these prompt assertions of citizenship — these cheerful sacrifices for the public weal — was arrayed the conspiracy, slowly but surely matured by the want of respect for, and confidence in, the institutions thus allowed so long to be abused and contemned. The defection of so many officers of the army and navy of the United States, at the most critical epoch in their history, is one of those phenomena that cannot be explained either by the pressure of local exactions, or the influence of a fanatical infatuation. The habit of irreverence, the decadence of public spirit, the discontent induced by want of sympathy, the hope of promotion, the fear of unpopularity, and the urgency of political adventurers, combined to seduce men of weak minds or blind ambition; either the fever of faction, or the want of moral courage, rendered many of them an easy prey to the arts of designing demagogues, or personal disappointment coincided with fallacious theories, to make them oblivious of, and insensible to, that honor which, in all ages, has been the first instinct and the essential characteristic of the hero and the gentleman. When a Southern commodore was urged to resign, and take up arms against his flag and government, by the traitors of his native State, he replied, ‘I have been in the service of the United States nearly half a century; have commanded three squadrons, been at the head of naval bureaus, enjoyed every honor, and had accorded every privilege in the line of my profession; and whatever social consideration I have enjoyed abroad, and honor and prosperity I have won at home, I owe to the sanction and the service bestowed on me by the government of my country; under these circumstances, fellow-citizens, would you, could you trust me, if I were to comply with your invitation?’ They replied in the

affirmative. ‘Then, gentlemen,’ said the gallant commodore, ‘I could not trust *you*.’ Many of these unprincipled renegades, and others who more justly may be called irresolute victims of what they call a ‘divided duty,’ have, since their desertion, bitterly repented, and already the social proscription inevitably following such dishonor has proved a speedy retribution. Still the fact remains; and whoever is familiar with the history of the American Revolution and the war of 1812,—whoever has felt pride, confidence, and protection in his nation’s flag in distant lands, or knows its significance as an emblem on ship, arsenal, court-house, and capitol, may imagine what a perversion of the highest human instinct and the noblest human sentiment there must have existed, to allow an American officer of the army or navy voluntarily to forswear his allegiance.” — pp. 8, 9.

“ *Cheap Cotton by Free Labor*,” if its calculations are as well founded as they are skilfully and accurately made, opens a subject of momentous interest to the inhabitants of the Free States, and of even greater importance to the seceding States. The author demonstrates — if his data are correct — that cotton may be raised with less pecuniary cost, less exhaustion of soil, and greater economy as to the secondary products of the culture, by free than by slave labor; that, even were the African race out of the question, there is disposable white force enough for a much larger than the present culture; and that the cotton lands are generally salubrious and free from dangerous epidemics. He proposes that the experiment be tried under the auspices of the national government, in Texas, where the German immigrants are already solving with marked success the problem of white labor in the cultivation of cotton; and he maintains that the result of the experiment would be the production of cotton at a remunerative price very considerably below the minimum at which slave-grown cotton can be furnished.

“ *The Rejected Stone*” in the last pamphlet on our list is the immediate emancipation of the slaves in the rebel States by the act of the general government. The treatise abounds in earnest thought and glowing rhetoric. The author reasons poorly; but he paints vividly. He is conversant with slavery and its evils; he is an ardent patriot and philanthropist; and his burning words cannot but arouse in other hearts the senti-

ments that glow in his own. We are not yet prepared to acquiesce in his conclusions. We agree with him that the rebels have forfeited constitutional protection for their human chattels ; we see plainly that the exigencies of the war may render emancipation inevitable ; but it seems to us that this measure would, in the present posture of affairs, be disastrous equally to the slaves and the now dominant race. Whenever the Africans receive the gift of freedom, it should be under circumstances in which their industry could be directed and employed for the common good. Otherwise, a war of races would be inevitable ; and this, while it might crush the rebellion, could hardly fail to make a desert of the soil on which it was waged.

ART. VIII.—1. *The Okavango River. A Narrative of Travel, Exploration, and Adventure.* By CHARLES JOHN ANDERSSON, Author of “Lake Ngami.” With numerous Illustrations and a Map of Southern Africa. New York : Harper and Brothers. 1861. 8vo. pp. 414.

2. *The Last Travels of Ida Pfeiffer: inclusive of a Visit to Madagascar. With an Autobiographical Memoir of the Author.* Translated by H. W. DULKEN. New York : Harper and Brothers. 1861. 12mo. pp. 281.

OUR instalment of “African Travels” for the past quarter is unusually small and insignificant. Only two works have come to our hand ; and these not of high or permanent value ;—neither of them adds much to geographical or ethnographical science ; neither of them has more than mediocre literary ability or finish. The first-named, indeed, must be pronounced a very poor specimen of book-making. The style of Mr. Andersson’s previous volume had not prepared us to expect a brilliant book ; but in interest and variety “The Okavango River” falls off largely from the sporting narrative of “Lake Ngami.” The bulk of the volume is ludicrously disproportioned to its substance of information, and the whole of the